REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action, and have canceled all claims and presented new claims in response thereto. It is respectfully submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of the present amendment, claims 1-8 and 24-31 were pending in the present application. Claims 1-31 have been canceled by virtue of the present amendment, and new claims 32-52 have been added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the foregoing amendment and the ensuing remarks are respectfully requested.

New claims 32-39 are substantively similar to canceled claims 1-8. However, new claims 32-39 relate to an *in vitro* *"method of producing mammalian cells in which neoplastic cellular proliferation or transformation, or both, is inhibited."* Support for these claims may be found throughout the Specification, as well as in claims 1-8 as originally filed in the present application.

New claim 40, and its dependent claims 41-44, relate to *"a mammalian cell produced by the method of claim 32."* Support for these claims may be found throughout the Specification; for example, at page 57, line 18 through page 58, line 5.

New claim 45, and its dependent claims 46-52, relate to a *"mammalian cell maintained* in vitro *that endogenously overexpresses PTTG1, and in which neoplastic cellular proliferation or transformation, or both, is inhibited."* The inventive mammalian cell includes the same composition that is described in claim 32. Support for these claims may thus be found throughout the Specification (*e.g.*, at page 57, line 18 through page 58, line 5), but also in original claims 1-8.

In the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 24-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, *"because the specification, while being enabling for inducing neoplastic transformation by PTTG1 polypeptide and the proline-rich domain of PTTG1 is important for PTTG-mediated neoplastic transformation, and overexpression of PTTG2 inhibits transactivation activity of PTTG1 by nearly half* in vitro, *does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of inhibiting neoplastic cellular [transformation] comprising any expression vector expressing a mammalian PTTG2 peptide to a mammalian cell via any administration route* in vivo*"* (emphasis added). By virtue of the present amendment, claims 1-8 and 24-31 have been canceled, thus rendering this rejection moot.

However, Applicants were cognizant of this rejection in drafting their new claims, which are directed, *inter alia*, to an *in vitro* *"method of producing mammalian cells in which neoplastic cellular proliferation or transformation, or both, is inhibited."*

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should Examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

Date: December 24, 2003

By: _____
Seth D. Levy
Registration No. 44,869
Attorney for Applicant(s)

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033